



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,872	03/19/2001	Jared J. Jackson	ARC920010008US1	1256

23334 7590 11/14/2008
FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

NAWAZ, ASAD M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2455

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/14/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptoboca@fggbb.com

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09812872	3/19/01	JACKSON, JARED J.	ARC920010008US1

FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

ASAD M. NAWAZ

ART UNIT	PAPER
2455	20081110

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief received 8/29/08 contains similar arguments as the Appeal brief filed 3/24/08. However, it is apparent that the appellant has misconstrued Examiner's responses to arguments. Appellants argue in substance that Examiner's position has changed regarding the combination of Lee and Holtz. It is from this general misinterpretation that appellants' arguments have come from. Appellants specifically argue that Examiner relies on Lee to teach "session information pertaining to the current communication session between the networked device and a server, the session information being separate from the request for delivery of image information and the image delivery parameter and the image presentation parameter associated with the networked device being contained in the session information". As is apparent from pages 5 and 10 of the Examiner's Answer filed 6/30/08 and the final rejection on 5/4/07, Examiner specifically points to Lee in view of Holtz for teaching this limitation. The appellant repeatedly states that Holtz is "silent regarding session information" (see reply brief page 8). Holtz specifically teaches session information pertaining to the current communication session between the networked device and a server, the session information being separate from the request for delivery of image information and the image delivery parameter and the image presentation parameter associated with the networked device being contained in the session information (abstract, 0207, 0213). Therefore, Lee in view of Holtz still teach the limitations as currently claimed.

No further action is deemed necessary by the Examiner and the case will be forwarded to the BPAI.

/saleh najjar/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455